

12 Compelling Reasons Not To Offer 'Free Profiles':

- ① Dilution of possible sales.
- ② a) "If the free listing doesn't work, why should I upgrade?"
b) "If the free listing does work, why should I upgrade?"
- ③ Free listing do not expire and become stale . . . and they become terrible testimonials. We lost a possible securities guy when he saw a competitor whom we had let in for free.
- ④ The limited number of free people we have comped have required more customer support than we typically provide to most of our experts.
- ⑤ Free listing poeple have no reason to want to be available for news media interview. They become drive-by sign-ups, as fully demonstrated by my "old buddy" Bill Hichenberger, whom we have placed as #1 at Google for "Brazil Expert." However, on his LinkedIN page, he notes that he has moved to France! *Our experts have to have skin in the game right here, right now.*
- ⑥ An obvious answer is that "free" persons are moochers. It's like that story of the ladies at the free lunch: One says that the food isn't very good, and then the other complains there is not enough of it. One moocher continued to complain about results as he pushed free news releases into the system.
- ⑦ Free is worthless. Even when we showed free on the order form in Scottsdale in 2008, no one took it! Repeat: Free is perceived as worthless.
- ⑧ The paid people loathe the possibility that "free" people exist.
- ⑨ We tried free from 1984 to 1998. We tried free in 2002 and 2003. Each period yielded little to nothing. Open-door, free trials do not work.
- ⑩ Our model is what we are. We cannot change: that model is what our experts pay for. The classic joke of "You are an expert as soon as the check clears" is appreciated by the news media. They, too, want the expert source to have skin in the game.
- ① ① We do not have the resources to moderate "free profiles" that would be filled with the likes of Dave Pounder: <http://www.PornographyExpert.com> who has tried to register multiple times.
- ① ② *We shall not waste any more time arguing about this.*